

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 30 2006

REMARKS

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, The Examiner noted the election of claims 1-11 and the withdrawal of claims 12-52.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration is requested.

The symbol "#" has been replaced with the word --pound-- which is an accepted meaning for this symbol. The term "obviously equivalent treatment" has been deleted from the text of claim 5. Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the differential is a measurable difference in adhesion. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-11 were provisionally rejected for obviousness double patenting over claims 1-11 of Serial No. 10/505,383. Since no claims have been allowed in the present application or in Serial No. 10/505,383, it is believed that this ground of rejection is premature because there can be no double patenting until claims have been allowed in the cited application. For this reason, it is requested that this rejection be held in abeyance pending the indication of allowable claims in Serial No. 10/505,383.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Fischer.

Reconsideration is requested.

The Fischer patent discloses a form having a detachable card element. The detachable card element is held in place

with a "peeling" adhesive which is an adhesive system that transfers the adhesive from the element to which it is applied to the card because the surface of the element to which the adhesive was originally applied was treated according to col. 3, lines 27-31 of Fischer.

When the Fischer method is followed, the peelable adhesive is transferred to the card as the card is removed. This peelable adhesive will cause the removed card to stick to other cards which is a distinct disadvantage of this system. The claims of the present invention, as amended, point out a process for making a business form with a detachable card where the adhesion of the card to the business form is controlled by forming of a pattern of selective variable adhesion in from 10 to 90 percent of the surface of the layer to which the card is adhered. Thus, when the card is to be removed, the areas of selective adhesion facilitate the removal of the card without the need to use a peelable adhesive because the adhesive properties of the surface have been modified. The Fischer technique requires that all of the surface of the layer to which the card is to be adhered, must be completely treated to reduce the adhesive properties. This is necessary in the Fischer because of the use of a peelable adhesive which is to be removed with the card (col. 5, lines 12-15). For these reasons, the Fischer patent fails to anticipate the amended claims of the present application and it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Fischer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Reconsideration is requested.

The Fischer patent has been distinguished from the amended claims above. There is no suggestion in Fischer that one should apply a pre-treatment to less than all of the surface of the layer to which the peelable adhesive is to be applied. Amended claim 1 points out that from 10 to 90 percent of the surface area of the layer which is adhered to the

removable card is to be pretreated and claim 8 points out that from 40 to 60 percent of the area of that layer is to be pretreated. This concept is not disclosed or suggested by the Fischer patent.

The applicant had noted the Examiner's arguments regarding the *prima facie* case of anticipation or obviousness. These arguments are believed to be in error because the cited reference does not disclose the basic concept of forming a pattern of decreased adhesion in connection with a removal card that is formed on a business form. The amended claims further define the pattern as a percentage of the area that is treated to reduce adhesion in order to avoid any argument that a pattern could include 100% of the surface area of a layer. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 1-10 of the Office Action, claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of Hoffman.

Reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner acknowledged that Fischer fails to teach what the percentage of the area of the surface of the layer that is adhered to the removable card would be the treated area. The citation of Hoffman as a secondary reference has been done without any teaching or suggestion in Fischer. The Hoffman reference is concerned with patterned adhesive that is used in connection with sealing edges of plastic films that are used in connections with foods such as meats that are to be cooked in the plastic film. There is no mention of the labeling arts or business forms in the Hoffman patent and for this reason, there is no valid reason to combine this patent with the Fischer patent. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan

Reg. No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 302-8989